REMARKS

Claims 1-67 were pending at the time of examination. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 21, 39 and 62 have been amended to correct a minor typographical error. The line numbering recommended by the Examiner has been added to the claims. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification on the basis that it contains hyperlinks, which may cause problems with regards to the potential for inclusion of new matter. The applicants respectfully would like to point out that there are no hyperlinks directed to specific Internet sites anywhere in the application (including the drawings), and assume that the Examiner's objection is an inadvertent oversight. Thus, the applicants respectfully request that the objection be removed.

The Examiner also objected to the specification because of the use of various trademarks. The applicants have identified all the occurrences of proper names, and concluded that none of them is used in connection with any specific products. Thus, the proper names not used in a trademark fashion, but are rather used as names of providers of various products, in which case they do not need to have the ^{TM} symbol attached to their names. Nevertheless, the suppliers do need to be uniquely identified, and therefore the applicants have amended the specification to add the full names and locations of the companies that are mentioned in the specification.

The applicants believe that the specification is now in allowable form and submit that all the objections to the specification be removed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The entire dependent claims section was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that the claim language was murky or not clearly understood since the first line of the dependent claims recite "A method..." and it is not clearly understood whether this refers to "A method..." in the independent claims. The applicants respectfully disagree. All the dependent method claims start with "A method as recited in claim X," where X denotes the base claim for the respective dependent claim. By using the language "as recited in claim X" in the dependent method claims,

Attorney. Docket No.: GCENP004   Page 18 of 23   Serial No.: 10/728,356

PAGE 20/25 * RCVD AT 12/6/2004 5:22:10 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:16509618301 * DURATION (mm-ss):06-42

the applicants submit that it is fully clear that the dependent method claims unambiguously refer to the methods in their respective base claims. The same reasoning applies to the dependent computer system claims, and the dependent computer program product claims, respectively. The applicants thus submit that none of the dependent claims is indefinite and that the rejection be removed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0058277 A1 to Bowman-Amuah et al. (hereinafter Bowman). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

The applicants' invention relates to apparatus and methods for effectively correlating messages sent between services. A message interchange network is configured to manage the use of services by remote entities or services within a computer network. Correlation information is stored for each message. The correlation information includes information for correlating each message with a specific call between two services, and with a specific session between two or more services (Specification, paragraph [010]).

Bowman, on the other hand, is directed to a <u>view configurer</u> in a presentation services patterns environment, which assigns a view to a particular activity. A notification is received that a startup event of an activity has occurred. A reference to a first instance of an object created by the startup event of the activity is also received. When the notification and the reference have been received, a view to launch is determined based on predetermined criteria, which may include user preferences, an experience level of a user, security profiles, and/or workflow settings. The view is associated with the activity and displayed. Alternatively, the activity can run without a corresponding view. The activity can operate on a machine separate from a machine of an end user (Bowman, paragraphs [0009]-[0010]).

Turning now to the specific rejections of the claims, claim 1 recites:

> "tracking correlation information regarding each message received into message interchange network, wherein the messages are being sent between pairs of the services, wherein the correlation information for each message pertains to each message and any other messages related to the each message"

That is, a message is sent between two services through the message interchange network, and when the message enters the message interchange network, correlation information regarding the message is tracked. The correlation information pertains to the message itself and

to <u>any other messages that are related to the message</u>. The Examiner rejected this step referring to Bowman paragraphs [0680], [0911], [1013], [1363], [1449], [1510], and to claim 8, respectively, adding that

> "tracking access rights for example is a way to keep track of privileged users have the ability to achieve information editing, inherently there is a log to keep track of activities and a log to keep track of the privileges; further, as an example, when information messages are sent between client and server, the services in between keeps track of correlation information."

Paragraph [0680] of Bowman lists a number of commercial products (JetForm's JetForm Design, Lotus Forms, and Visual Basic) that can be used to implement a component for form development. Paragraph [0911] of Bowman discusses that documents should be accessed exclusively through a document management backbone, so that only users with the correct security privileges can access the documents and perform operations on the documents. Paragraph [1013] of Bowman is a general description of how Internet telephony products work, that is, voice input is accepted into a workstation, which translates the voice input into an IP data stream and sends it through the Internet to a destination workstation, where the data is translated back into audio. Paragraph [1363] of Bowman is a brief description of how Computer-Telephone Integration (CTI) integrates computer systems and telephone systems to coordinate data and telephony activities. Paragraph [1449] of Bowman mentions firewall services as a way to protect sensitive resources and information attached to an Internet or Intranet network from unauthorized access by enforcing an access control policy. Paragraph [1510] of Bowman gives a brief overview of the Transport Services component of the Communication Fabric of Bowman. The Transport Services provides the underlying protocols responsible for transmitting and securing data communications, and is responsible for establishing, maintaining, and terminating end-to-end communications between users and processes. Finally, claim 8 states that the predetermined view of an activity in Bowman is based on criteria that includes user preferences, an experience level of the user, security profiles, or workflow settings.

The above recited claim limitation refers to tracking <u>correlation information</u>. As described in paragraph [010] of the applicants' specification, the correlation information includes information for correlating each message with a <u>specific call between two services</u>, and with a <u>specific session between two or more services</u>. None of the paragraphs cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, teaches tracking correlation information that includes information about a specific call and a specific session between two or more services, and in particularly not that

"the correlation information for each message pertains to each message and any other messages related to the each message," as required by the claim limitation.

The description of the form development products in paragraph [0680] does not mention any techniques for tracking correlation information. It merely states that the JetForm Design product "provides tools to design, fill, route, print and manage electronic forms," that the Lotus Forms product "provides tools to design, route and track forms to automate business processes," and that the Visual Basic product "provides a comprehensive development for building complex applications."

The cited paragraphs [0911] and [1013] address security concerns of a network - in particular what the policies should be for checking out documents from a document management backbone, and that a firewall can protect sensitive resources from unauthorized access, respectively. Again, the above claim limitation is directed to tracking correlation information – not to resolving security issues. The Examiner further stated "inherently there is a log to keep track of activities and a log to keep track of the privileges." However, Bowman does not describe any such logs or any type of correlation information (if any) that would be stored in such logs. Even though the applicants realize that there needs to be some kind of mechanism to keep track of activities and privileges in an environment where access rights are tracked, the applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization that these alleged inherent logs would in any manner anticipate the "tracking correlation information" claim limitation.

The cited paragraphs [1013] and [1363] discuss Internet telephony products and CTI at a very high level, and do not mention what kind of information is tracked, if any. The applicants realize that some level of tracking must occur when audio is converted into a stream of packets that are sent over a network from one service to another, but respectfully submit that no description has been provided in Bowman of what type of tracking occurs in the telephony applications described in paragraphs [1013] and [1363]. Even if some type of correlation information were tracked in these telephony applications, it is likely that the tracking would occur at a packet level rather than at a message level, and that the tracking would certainly not pertain to "each message and any other messages related to the each message," as required by claim one. At the very least, a better explanation is required from the Examiner as to why the claimed limitation would be anticipated by these cited paragraphs.

Finally, the cited paragraph [1510] that describes the Transport Services merely states that the Transport Services are "responsible for establishing, maintaining and terminating end-to-end communications between users and processes" and that the Connection management provides transfer services that "ensure the delivery of data from sender to receiver" and that

"initiate a connection, gracefully terminate a connection, and handle abrupt termination." Moreover, these services take place "before and after the data is formatted for transport over the network," not within the computer network, as required by claim 1. Even if the Transport Services and the Connection management did take place within the computer network, the description would not be sufficient to anticipate the limitations of claim 1. Thus, the applicants respectfully submit that none of these cited paragraphs, alone or in combination, can reasonably teach or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons the rejection of claim 1 is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-26 all depend from claim 1, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejections of claims 2-26 should be withdrawn.

Claim 27 is a computer system claim with limitations similar to the limitations of claim 1, and is therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claims 27 should be withdrawn.

Claims 28-41 all depend from claim 27, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 27, and the rejections of claims 28-41 should be withdrawn.

Claim 42 is a *Beauregard* claim corresponding to claim 1, and is therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claim 42 should be withdrawn.

Claims 43-67 all depend from claim 42, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 42, and the rejections of claims 43-67 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Fredrik Mollborn
Reg. No. 48,587

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300